



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(3.) A third miracle consists in bringing down from heaven the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. On this part of the subject it is difficult to speak with that reverence which a topic so truly awful demands; suffice it, therefore, to say, that according to this doctrine of the Church of Rome, the same five words which, pronounced by the priest, have wrought upon each and every wafer which he intends to consecrate the two stupendous miracles of which we have spoken, works also upon the Body and Blood of Christ, as He is sitting at the right hand of God, similar miracles, with this exception only, that whereas the substance of the bread was annihilated, the substance of the body of Christ is only separated from its form and sensible species, and brought down from heaven, in this miraculous state of separation, into the hands of the priest.

(4.) A fourth miracle is this: the substance of the Body of Christ, thus separated from its form, and brought down from heaven, is miraculously inserted into the spaces left void by the annihilation of the substance of the wafers; and, notwithstanding the narrow dimensions of the voided space, and the far greater bulk previously occupied by the substance of our Saviour's Body, the latter is miraculously substituted for the former, without any alteration in the outward appearance, weight, figure, taste, or other sensible qualities of the wafer, and without its being possible for the most acute sense, or the most minute examination, to detect the smallest difference in any of these qualities after transubstantiation, from those which the wafer exhibited before.

(5.) A fifth miracle consists in the actual multiplication of the substance of our Lord's Body thus marvellously brought down from heaven, so that the whole, and entire, and unbroken, or undiminished Body of Christ shall be found at one and the same moment in all and every one of the wafers or fragment of the wafers, thus consecrated. Nay, though a thousand priests were consecrating at the same moment at a thousand altars, in all the ends of the earth, each and all the wafers on all these thousand altars and every fragment of those wafers, should alike possess the substance of Christ's body in lieu of their own annihilated substance, and possess it undiminished and unbroken, so that in each one of these wafers, nay in each fragment of these wafers, the whole and perfect Body of the Lord is concealed, and, as it were, multiplied *ad infinitum*.

These five miracles, wrought upon the bread, or wafer, by the intention of the priest and the repetition of the sacred words of consecration, are repeated in the same order and manner upon the consecrated wine: the substance of the wine is annihilated, the form or sensible qualities of the wine are still preserved, and made to affect the senses as before; the substance of Christ's Blood is brought down from heaven, separated from its form; it is inserted into the vacuum created by the annihilation of the wine; and, lastly, the same multiplication of the Blood is miraculously effected, so that in every the minutest drop or particle of the transubstantiated wine the whole Blood of Christ is contained, and taken by the communicant who is privileged to drink it.

6. The above ten miracles are absolutely essential to every mass, and without them the transubstantiation could not be effected. But great and stupendous as they are, are not even yet sufficient to complete the Roman theory, or to protect the doctrine it involves from all its difficulties.

It has sometimes happened that the consecrated hosts, kept too long, have become corrupt like ordinary wafers, and even given birth to worms; that the consecrated wine, in like manner, has become vinegar, and mouldy, even like common wine. How is this, if their substance has been annihilated? and if in its place has been substituted the incorruptible substance of the Body and Blood of Christ?

To meet this and similar difficulties new miracles are necessary; but in discussing this subject we cannot trust ourselves to speak except in the language of Romanist divines themselves.

The question is this:—since the Eucharist, or consecrated Host, possesses no substance, except the substance of the Body of Christ, and since corruption cannot take place except in substance (for these positions are admitted by the school divines), what are we to conclude from the fact, which is also admitted, that the consecrated host may become mouldy and corrupt? This corruption cannot take place in the substance of that Body of which it is written, that He shall see no corruption; and, therefore, to meet the difficulty, Romanist divines are under the necessity of having recourse to another miracle, by supposing that before this corruption takes place the substance of Christ's body, of its own accord, departs from the consecrated wafer; that the substance of the wafer which had been annihilated, or some equivalent substance, is spontaneously created again, and restored to its original place; so that the Host again, of its own accord (or rather without any additional act on the part of the priest), by a new miracle, becomes an ordinary wafer, and that as soon as this change is effected the work of corruption instantaneously begins and goes on according to the usual laws of nature.

This theory is thus stated by the celebrated Duns Scotus.*

* Sive per alterationem, sive per motum in quantitate corruptatur eucharistia, redit de facto substantia: et hæc est substantia composita cui talia accidentia convenienter quam etiam afficiunt; et hoc in instanti corruptionis et immediate a Deo.

Ima, pars hujus probatur, quia Deus statuit illas species manentes esse aline subjecto in eucharistia precise et non alibi, ergo statuit quod eadem eucharistia non sunt species sine subjecto et per consequens in ipso instanti corruptionis fit ibi aliqua substantia.

"Whether the Eucharist be corrupted by alteration, or by motion in quantity, a substance, in fact, returns, and this is the same compound substance to which such accidents agree, and which they belong to. And this takes place in the very instant of the corruption and by the immediate interference of God."

His arguments in support of this theory are given in the original Latin, in the note, but it is not necessary for our present purpose to translate them, as we are only concerned with the theory itself.

(Continued in page 128.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We earnestly request our correspondents, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, to limit the length of their communications, when possible, and not in any case to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nonusers of the subscriber.

All letters meant for publication should be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street, and the real name and address given, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, NOVEMBER 18, 1858.

WE have at length, from a source on which Roman Catholics may rely, the facts of the Mortara case. We give the following from the *Tablet* newspaper of November 6th, 1858:—

"From the *Univers* of Wednesday we learn that the facts of the case, which have to a certain extent been neglected, while the question was being discussed theoretically, are as follows:—In November, 1857, one Marianna Bajesi gave information to the ecclesiastical authorities at Bologna that the child of Salomon Mortara, a Modenese Jew, residing at Bologna, had been baptised. Her statement was, that a respectable person, seeing one of the children of Mortara at the point of death (this child did really die), advised the Mortaras' servant, Anna Morisi, to baptise it. The servant refused on the ground that some years before she had baptised another child of Mortara in a like danger; that this child (the subject of the present controversy) had not died, but had reached the age of seven years, and that she was greatly troubled about it. In consequence of the statement of Bajesi, Anna Morisi, the servant of Mortara, was summoned before the inquisitor, and declared on oath that Edgard Mortara, the son of Salomon, who about two years old, was taken so violently ill that his father and mother were in tears, expecting, as did every one in the house, that it was about to die. A layman with whom the servant was conversing in this affliction told her that if the child was really in danger she would be doing a good action by baptizing it. She inquired how it was done. The neighbour instructed her minutely, and at night, the child being worse, and apparently about to breathe its last, she poured water on its head, saying, 'I baptise thee in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Being asked her intention in doing this, she replied that her intention was to baptise the child, according to the spirit of the Church, in order to save a soul. As a Christian, she wished that this soul should not be lost. She was under the conviction that it could not live. It becomes, therefore, clear that the child was baptised not only validly but licitly, according to the rule of Benedict XIV.

"Cum filius Hebræorum consignatus fuisset nutrici Christianæ, in deficientia nutrimenti Hebræorum, dum esset proximus morti fuit baptizatus et sacra congregatio declaravit prædictum puerum fuisse licite baptizatum.

"An attempt has been made to deny the danger of the child, and a certificate of the medical attendant has been produced, dated July 31, 1858, four years after the illness and baptism. The certificate, under the circumstances, is immaterial, and cannot displace the facts sworn to by the servant. To resume. We have the Modenese Mortaras voluntarily submitting themselves to the laws of the Roman State, and breaking these laws by retaining a Christian servant. We have this servant baptizing their child, legally and rightfully, according to her duty, when in danger of death. She certainly did not act from malice, for her master is satisfied with her, and retains her in his service. She certainly did not act from fanaticism, or

2da. pars probatur, quia si aliqua substantia redit, non alia quam illa quæ potest illi accidentibus novis affici, quia alia substantia non esset casus.

3ia. pars probatur, sc. quid non redit immediate nisi a Deo, quia nullum a iud. agens habet virtutem activam ad hoc sufficientem, non ergo resit substantia composita dum accidenti eucharistia inveniunt. . . . nec redit materia sive per reparationem seu resurrectionem seu creationem, quia hoc esset omnino superfluum, cum per materiam solam non posset magis salvari actio aliquid agens naturalis. - Lib. iv. Sent. dist. 13, q. 6, c. Dico ergo.

* These are scientific terms in the philosophy of that day, which it is not necessary for our present purpose to explain.

from a desire to make proselytes unfairly; for it was not she who revealed that she had baptised the elder child, and she refused to give baptism to the younger, who unfortunately died. All the declamations that we read have no other base than these facts."

But softly, good *Tablet*; do take a little time, and finish the facts; for more facts there are in this case as a base for "declamation."

What a harmless "inquisitor!" He only sent for the servant girl, Anna Morisi, and asked her just to tell him the story! And is it for that little harmless curiosity of an "inquisitor" that all Europe, Protestant and Roman Catholic (all except Ireland), is ringing with shouts of "shame" against the Pope and his government?

There are some other little facts in the case, and the *Tablet* knows them very well, but leaves it to us to tell them.

"Inquisitors" of the Church of Rome were once terrible indeed to parents and to children. Many a broken heart has cursed them in its bitterness or died in its despair, at the desolation of parental or filial affection. And terrible indeed these "inquisitors" seem now resolved to make themselves again to parents and to children.

This "inquisitor," on hearing the story of Anna Morisi, did do something further. He sent the police to tear this child of seven years of age from the arms of its father and its mother, and to announce to them that their child they should never see again!

There is another fact yet:

The distracted parents appealed to the Pope, that kind, benevolent, old man, Pius IX.—their spiritual father—their temporal sovereign—bound alike in both capacities to do them justice.

The Pope has decreed that the inquisitor did right, and that the bereaved parents shall never have their child again!

The parents have besought the holy father that they might, at the least, be allowed to look upon their child once more.

Letters from Rome state that the Pope told them they should see their child once more. On that they set off to the place of his confinement, and then they were told they should never see it; and they were hunted out of the town by the police, on the pretence that they had no "passports." We presume that the "inquisitor" will take due care that they are not to have passports for that town in future.

These are additional facts, on which not merely "declamation," but a cry of indignation has been raised by every civilized country at the conduct of the Pope.

We believe that every newspaper in Roman Catholic France, except the *Univers* (the French *Tablet*), has joined in this cry. Russia, Italy, Germany, Belgium, have re-echoed it. All Europe is ringing with it. So loud is the cry, and so much is the Pope frightened, that, it seems, his holiness has already found it necessary to write to every court in Europe to try and excuse his conduct. We take the following from the same number of the *Tablet*:—

"A letter in the *Emancipation* of Brussels says: That the holy father had addressed a note to the European Courts on the Mortara case. The note sets forth the parent's petition, relates the circumstances under which the child was baptised, and declares that the baptism is irrevocable. The attacks which have been made on religion and the holy father, in connection with this affair, are left unnoticed."

The Pope still maintains his wrongful act, and the *Tablet* still defends it, though both evidently in terror at the storm of outraged feeling that is every day getting louder throughout Europe.

How critical the outcry is getting may appear from the fact that the *Tablet*, which has hitherto tried not to speak of the subject, has no less than three articles on it in the number for November 6. We now proceed to examine the article containing their defence of the Pope's act.

"We owe an apology to our subscribers for troubling

them again with the 'affair Mortara,' which is a plain question of the *Catechism*, requiring no learning for its solution—only a little grace to receive it as it ought to be received. But, unfortunately, that little grace is wanting to the furious infidels who create the disturbance, and darken a question clear as the sun at noon. The child Mortara has acquired rights which no human power can take away, but by violence, and for the loss of which no government can ever make any compensation. The act which made him a Christian is irrevocable, beyond the powers of any tribunal to annul, and by that act he became as a dead child to his Hebrew father (so far as the authority of the latter over his religion was concerned), as completely as if he had died a natural death. Neither he nor his parents, it is true, consented to the deed; but that absence of consent cannot vitiate it, because the act of baptism, once validly complete, remains for ever indelible, whatever may be his education or the future habits of his life."

We ask attention to the admission here made, that this outrage on the common feelings and rights of humanity is a necessary consequence of the Roman doctrine about baptism. From which alone, those who understand the simplest rules of Christian action which the Gospel teaches, may assume that doctrine of baptism to be erroneous.

We proceed now to examine the justification of this outrage:—

"As to the act of baptism and the absence of parental consent, that is easily disposed of, like all other irrevocable acts to which human life is liable. So far as the Jews are concerned, it is an accident which they could not prevent; they **LOST THEIR CHILD** by baptism, as they might have lost it by fire or sudden death. Every family is exposed to some danger or other in rearing their infants; nurses may be careless, and thereby occasion mutilation, loss of eyes, or broken limbs. The matter is irrevocable, and people must endure what they were unable to prevent."

And again:—

"It may be hard upon individuals that they should suffer, without remedy, the consequence of a single act to which they were not parties at all, still less consenting parties. But such is the condition of human life, we are all liable to losses from the acts of others, and cannot protect ourselves."

This argument might have been more briefly expressed thus: "Let the Jew dogs grin, and bear it."

The *Tablet* admits that this defence applies to loss by fire as well as to "loss by baptism." Well, there have been losses by fire too. Parents have lost their children by fire, and children have lost their parents by fire, when Roman inquisitors have burned those children or parents in the fire, for the good of their souls. And the defence of the *Tablet* for tyranny and cruelty is just as good for this case as for loss by baptism: "The matter is irrevocable, and people must endure what they were unable to prevent!" But is that any excuse for those who perpetrated the outrage, or who could have prevented or remedied it, and would not?

We have yet another article. The *Tablet* can be very virtuously indignant at any interference between parent and child when any excuse can be found for charging it on Protestants. The Pope can't bear to see parental feeling outraged by any one else—because that is the exclusive privilege of himself and his religion.

The *Tablet* quotes an article from the *Morning Star*, headed "Protestant Missionaries in India."

The facts were briefly these. A native Indian placed a son at a native school. The boy got among Christians, and wished to be a Christian. The missionaries received him into their house. The father came to take him away. The missionaries left the boy to his own free choice, to go or stay. The boy refused to go with his father. The father brought the case by *habeas corpus* before Sir C. Rawlinson, Chief Justice of Madras. The case turned on the age of the boy, as British law will not allow a boy under 14 years of age to absent himself from the house of his father. The boy stated that he was 16 years of age; the father stated that he was 13. No clear evidence was given on either side. Sir C. Rawlinson ordered the boy to be restored to his father. A year hence the boy will be allowed to act for himself in choosing his own religion.

On this the *Tablet* observes—

"As for the parent, in the language

of our Parsee correspondent, 'He goes home with a broken heart.' And this is no isolated case, but happens in hundreds of instances. All which we commend to the attention of the press, which is so actively espousing the cause of the young Mortara's father.—Ed. *Tablet*."

We give it our attention, and we ask our readers to "look upon this picture and on that."

The Indian boy is 13 years old, at least, and has evidently a will of his own about choosing his own religion, and voluntarily leaves his father. Yet the British judge restores him to the custody and control of his father.

The Italian boy is only seven years old, and, of course, is incapable of making any choice of a religion for himself. This child is dragged out of his parents' arms, by the most tyrannical police in the world. The Roman judge (the Pope himself) refuses to give up the child to the outraged parents. And the Pope refuses on the ground that his religion teaches and requires him to support and maintain such an outrage as this.

We trust our readers will weigh and compare the comparative merits of British and of Roman law.

We ask our Protestant readers to consider that it is in the power of any Roman Catholic nurse employed by Protestant parents to baptize by stealth the infant entrusted to her care; and if she does so even in the dead of night, without its parents' knowledge or consent, still, if the Pope be right in the *Mortara* case, such child thereby becomes *his* subject; and it will be his duty and privilege (if in his power) to drag it from its Protestant parents and bring it up a Roman Catholic. Nay, we see not why his claim should not extend to every Protestant child baptized with water in the name of the Holy Trinity, no matter by whom performed, as even lay baptism, though by heretical hands, is universally recognised as a *valid* baptism by the ecclesiastical laws of Rome as well as of England.

We ask our Roman Catholic readers to conceive their own feelings if an armed police should enter their house to tear out of their arms for ever a child of seven years old, to educate him as a Protestant. We ask them next to consider and apply that great law of Christ, "All things, therefore, whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them. For this is the law and the Prophets" (Mat. vii. 12, Douay Bible).

Let them, then, try the act of the Pope by the law of Christ. And let them consider what St. Paul says of that law:—"The law is not made for the just man, but for the unjust and disobedient. . . . for men stealers!" (1 Tim. i. 9, 10, Douay Bible). The Pope is the man stealer just now; and that law is for him, if he will submit himself to the law of Christ.

"The Cardinal's fast," and the bill of fare on which he fasted, which we were the first to publish, and which, with our translation, was inserted in full in the *Times* of the 4th inst., has obtained a world-wide notoriety in the columns of that journal.

We take the following from the *Tablet* of November 6:—

"The *Times* of Thursday gave a short report of the Cardinal Archbishop's lecture in one column, and side by side with it a letter headed 'A Cardinal's fast,' and containing the bill of fare of the Dundalk banquet, at which his Eminence was a guest. The day was Friday, Sept. 3, a day of abstinence, and the dinner was a fish dinner. As to the dishes on the table, the *Times* correspondent may be safely left to the committee and the cook, the only responsible parties. A worthy correspondent writes to us by no means to pass this over, and to note especially that the 3rd September was not a fast day, but a simple day of abstinence from flesh meat, &c., &c. But when the *Times* stoops so low as to these miserable *petiteses*, is it not better to leave it to the verdict of the public?"

The *Tablet* appears to feel that the subject is a tender one. We have, however, elicited the important admission that Friday is *not* a fast day, and that the observances of Roman Catholics on

that day is *not* fasting. When those observances come under discussion hereafter, let both Protestants and Catholics remember that any argument drawn from Scripture or experience, or any other source, to prove the use and advantage of *fasting*, will be wholly beside the question. The Friday observance must henceforward be defended on some grounds wholly distinct from *fasting*.

The *Tablet* concludes thus:—

"If the editor of the *Times* had come to the Cardinal's lecture, and sought to lessen the effect of his discourse, by shouting any of the slang inquiries of the London gamins, it would have had as much effect, and been as much beneath notice."

The allusion appears to be to a well known popular inquiry, which is seldom replied to. In the case of "the fast," however, the inquiry which we stirred up has elicited an important admission.

THE SACRIFICE IN THE MASS AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

(Continued from page 127.)

We omit the question which is at issue between the Scotists and Thomists, whether the sacramental species can produce a substance; it must suffice to observe that St. Thomas Aquinas thinks they can; therefore, in his theory a less expenditure of miracle is necessary. Scotus, however, maintains that "nothing can corrupt a substance, unless it has the power of producing a substance; but mere species cannot produce substance in any given matter;" from which he infers, as we have seen, that the production of a new substance, which is necessary in order to explain the phenomenon of corruption, must be the immediate work of God Himself.

The arguments of Scotus, Thomas Aquinas, William Ockam, Alexander de Hales, &c., are given and discussed at length in Gabriel Biel's celebrated exposition of the canon of the Mass (Lect. 45); who also at some length argues the question whether the species of the wine can of themselves inebriate, and on this point he quotes the sentiments of Alex. Alensis and St. Bonaventure. The other party, however, of the schoolmen denied that this power of inebriating could belong to the mere species, and, therefore, maintained the doctrine that a miraculous restoration of their natural substances took place in this case also, as well as in the case of corruption.

Then comes another great question, whether the sacramental species communicate to the body of the recipient any nutriment. On this, in like manner, the schools are divided, the same party who attribute an inebriating quality to the species finding no difficulty, of course, in attributing to them a nutritive quality also. But here starts up a new difficulty, and with it the necessity for a new miracle; the species, if it be nutritive, must, in order to be so, be converted into the substance of the body of the recipient; for this is what is meant by nutrition; but species, being of its own essence distinct from substance, cannot be converted into substance; therefore, we must suppose that at the instant when the process of digestion commences, the substance of Christ's body is withdrawn and the original substance of the bread and wine miraculously restored.

This theory is thus stated by Biel.^k

"Hence, it appears that the sacramental species are nutritive; and that in giving nutriment to him who receives the Eucharist, they are converted into the substance of the body of him who takes them, not the very species, because species cannot be converted into substance. But a nutritive substance produced anew on the instant of the departure of the Body of Christ, refreshes and nourishes altogether, as if bread had been converted into nutriment."

Again, the sacrament may chance to be eaten by a mouse, or it may accidentally fall into a fire, and be reduced to ashes: in such cases new questions arise, which are solved in a similar manner. On this subject, Biel cites the authority of Pope Innocent,^l to the effect "that the Body of the Lord in such cases instantly disappears, and a new substance, as a support to the accidents, is miraculously created and substituted; or that the natural substances of the elements, which had been annihilated, are

^k "Nihil potest corrumpere substantiam nisi habeat virtutem producendi substantiam; sed species non possunt producere substantiam in quacunque materia."

^l "Virtus naturalis relictis in speciebus naturaliter potest immutari sensus: unde bene concedo quod virtus vitalis mirabiliter relictis in specie potest naturaliter agere in gustum, et in tanta quantitate potest sustinere quod inebriaret naturaliter."

^m "Et illo patet quod species sacramentalis nutrit, et quod in nutritione sumuntur eucharistici convertuntur in substantiam corporis sumunt; non enim species illæ: quia species in substantiam converti non possunt. Sed sacramentalis substantia de novo producta in instanti desinitio corporis Christi reficit et nutrit per omnia, ac si panis conversus fuisset in nutrimentum."

ⁿ "Si quis querat quid a mure comedatur? vel quod inebrietur cum sacramentum creatur? Respondetur, quod acut miraculose substantia panis convertitur in corpus Domini, et inest ac sub sacramento, sic ipsa quodammodo miraculose reuertitur cum ipsum corpus Domini in illi desinit esse. Neque enim in aliis operibus mirabilibus expleto officio propter quod condita erant, illa que mirabiliter erant condita reducta sunt in primum statum, sicut dicitur de columba in qua apparuit Spiritus Sanctus, viz., quod peracto officio suo in præloquium redivit materiam unde assumpta est; similiter et stellæ magorum dicitur: quod peracto officio mox esse desinit, rever enim in præloquium naturam unde sumpta fuerat. . . . ac dicitur esse in proposito, quod quando species desinunt esse sacramentum, substantiæ naturales specierum in eam reuertuntur statim, sicut prius fuerunt miraculose transmutatæ."